

REMARKS:

The courtesies extended to the undersigned by Examiner Jonathan Snelting and by SPE Saul Rodriguez during the personal interview held in the subject U.S. patent application on March 30, 2001, are acknowledged and appreciated. As discussed during the interview, applicants, their principal representatives in Germany, and the undersigned have again carefully reviewed the prior art cited and relied on in the rejection of the claims. In response, the claims have again been amended in order to more clearly patentably define the subject invention over the prior art cited and relied on in the rejection of the claims. It is believed that the claims now pending in the application are patentable over that prior art. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

A third Request for Continued Examination is being filed concurrently herewith to provide the Examiner with sufficient time to fully examine this Fifth Amendment.

As discussed during the interview of March 30, 2011, new claim 168 is being submitted at this time. New claim 168 is directed essentially to the embodiment of the invention which is depicted in Fig. 8. As is shown in Fig. 8, there are provided two separate ones of the web-processing machines 06 which are laterally spaced from each other. Each one of the two web-processing machines 06 has its own separate intermediate reel storage area 11 that includes a plurality of storage spaces 13. A separate secondary transport carriage 32 is provided in each of the laterally spaced web-processing machines and is movable along its own straight transport route 12 that

extends directly from the associated intermediate web storage area to the reel changer of each one of the two separate, laterally spaced web-processing machines.

A reel receiver 4a is used to receive full reels of material from a main storage area and supplies those full reels of material to a reel preparation station, generally at 03. The reel preparation station 03 is a shared reel preparation station in the sense that it receives the full reels of material from the reel receiver, prepares the reels for usage in either one of the two laterally spaced web-processing machines 06 and delivers the prepared reels of material to ones of the primary transport carriages 27. The primary transport carriages are each able to support one of the full reels of material in the shared reel preparation station and to deliver the prepared full reel of material to one of the separate intermediate reel storage areas in each of the two laterally spaced web-processing machines. As was discussed with Examiners Snelting and Rodriguez, it is believed that newly presented claim 168 is patentable over the prior art of record.

In the Final Office Action of January 20, 2011, in the subject U.S. patent application, claims 89, 91, 93, 100, 101, 121, 123, 126, 131, 132, 134, 135, 145-150, and 156 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the CONTIWEB materials submitted by the applicants in view of U.S. patent No. 6,138,938 to Lehmrieder. Claims 118-120, 154, and 155 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the CONTIWEB materials, in view of Lehmrieder and further in view of U.S. published patent application No. 2003/0164102 to Schaefer. Claim 122 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the CONTIWEB materials, in view of Lehmrieder and further in view of U.S. published patent application No. 2004/0091340 to Allemann.

As was discussed during the interview of March 30, 2011, independent claim 89 has now been cancelled and new independent claim 168 has been added. It is believed that the structure recited in newly submitted independent claim 168 is neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious over, the prior art materials of record in the subject application, including those materials submitted with the Third Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, which was filed on March 9, 2011.

In that Third Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, there were submitted several drawings which were sent to Herr Jürgen Stiel, the house patent counsel for the assignee of the subject application, by a Mr. Lex Bruggers of Goss/International. The materials include what appeared to the undersigned to be two copies of a drawing entitled, ARANDELL CORP., MENOMONEE FALLS, WI. As discussed with the Examiner, these two drawings each appear to show two perspective views of a web-processing machine. It is believed that in each drawing, the lower figure is of the web-processing machine with the reel changer at the lower right and that the upper figure is of the same web-processing machine, as viewed from the opposite side, and with the reel changer at the upper left. The Equipment Description, dated December 19, 2003, and which is believed to be directed to the equipment shown in the drawings, recites that there is provided, "1 Basic Sunday 3000/32 Press". In other words, the depiction in the drawings, labeled ARANDELL CORP., are left and right perspective views of the same single press assembly. There is no teaching or suggestion in this drawing of the provision of two laterally spaced web-processing machines that share a common reel preparation station, as recited in currently pending

independent claim 168. The ARANDELL CORP. drawings also do not appear to teach or suggest the arrangement of primary and secondary transport carriages, and their cooperation, all as recited in currently pending, independent claim 168.

The prior art Lehneder patent, No. 6,138,938, was discussed during the course of the interview held March 30, 2011. It was noted that Fig. 1 depicts a plurality of roll changers 2, all aligned in a horizontal row at the bottom of Fig. 1. There are nine such roll changers so depicted in Fig. 1. The whole assembly depicted in Fig. 1 above those nine roll changers is all a part of an overall installation for loading and unloading rolls automatically. As is discussed in column 2 of the Lehneder reference, starting at line 40 thereof, "... a portion of the installation for transporting and pivoted horizontal rolls 11, which is located between the transfer stations 13, 14 and the roll changers 2 of the web-fed rotary printing press, is symmetrically constructed in the present exemplary embodiment, so that for the sake of simplicity only the right half will be described ...". In other words, there is intended to be provided, in the prior art Lehneder device, two separate roll handling and processing arrangements, each located on a separate side of the single line of roll changers 2. This is essentially the reverse of the subject invention, as recited in newly presented independent claim 168.

During the interview of March 30, 2011, Examiner Snelting and the undersigned discussed the depiction in the ARANDELL CORP. drawing and in the Lehneder reference. It is again to be noted that neither of these two references nor their possible combination would render obvious the subject invention, as recited in newly presented, independent claim 168. ARANDELL shows two views of the same single printing press.

Lehnrieder shows a portion of an arrangement where two different reel processing and storage areas are placed on both sides of a line of reel changers. While the web-processing stations, i.e., the printing couples of the Lehnrieder device, which are associated with these same reel changers, are not specifically depicted, it is assumed that they are all printing towers which are located above each such reel changer.

As was discussed with Examiner Snelling by telephone on March 31, 2011, all of the remaining claims in the application are dependent claims. All of those claims, including the ones that were previously withdrawn from consideration, have been amended, where necessary, to conform them to the language of newly presented independent claim 168. It is believed that all of these dependent claims, including those presently withdrawn from consideration, are all properly dependent from believed allowable independent claim 168.

During the interview, the secondary reference to Allemann, U.S. patent application publication No. 2004/0091340, was discussed briefly. That secondary reference was cited for its disclosure of a computer control system, which is not part of the subject invention, as currently claimed. The Allemann reference is directed to a paper roll change system for a single reel changer, as seen most clearly in Fig. 3. As such, it is not believed to be relevant to the claimed invention.

SUMMARY:


New independent claim 168 has been submitted. As was discussed during the interview of March 30, 2011, it is believed that this claim is patentable over the prior art cited and relied on in the rejection of the claims. All of the dependent claims now pending in this application, including those previously withdrawn from consideration, are believed to properly depend from believed allowable, independent claim 168.

A third Request for Continued Examination is being filed concurrently with the filing of this Fifth Amendment. Allowance of the claims and passage of the application to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Erwin Paul Josef LEHRIEDER et al.  
Applicants

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
Attorneys for Applicants

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas R. Hanscom  
Reg. No. 26,600

April 14, 2011

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
Customer No. 23294  
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
Phone: (703) 415-1500  
Fax: (703) 415-1508  
E-mail: mail@jonestullarcooper.com

Attorney Docket: W1.2305 PCT-US